

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 were pending in the application prior to this response. All claims were rejected. Claims 1-6 and 8-16 have been amended herein and claim 7 has been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejections of all pending claims is requested.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-16 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over publication 2002/0147717 of Barros et al. in view of Anderson (6,538,698).

CLAIM 1

Claim 1 is independent and, as amended herein, is directed toward:

A method of organizing image files, comprising:

determining at least one first sorting criteria and at least one second sorting criteria associated with said at least one first sorting criteria;

determining a data path, said data path indicating the location of at least two image files;

sorting a plurality of image files, located by said data path, into sets of image files based on said at least one first sorting criteria and said at least one second sorting criteria;

creating at least one directory for at least one set of said image files; and moving at least one set of image files into the corresponding directory.

Claim 1 has been amended herein so as to better describe the organization of image files. The applicant contend that Barros does not disclose "sorting a plurality of image files, located by said data path, into sets of image files based on said at least one first sorting criteria and said at least one second sorting criteria" as claimed in claim 1.

The applicant further contend that the above-described element of claim 1 is not disclosed by Anderson. More specifically, there is no disclosure in Anderson related to first and second sorting criteria.

Based on the foregoing, the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection.

CLAIM 2-6 AND 10

Claims 2-6 and 10 are ultimately dependent on claim 1 and are deemed allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicants request reconsideration of the rejections.

CLAIMS 8 AND 9

Claim 8 is dependent on claim 1 and, as amended herein, is directed toward:

The method of claim 1 wherein said at least one first sorting criteria is the resolution of images represented by said image files.

Claim 9 is dependent on claim 1, and as amended herein, is directed toward:

The method of claim 1 further comprising:

selecting a file type, wherein said at least one first sorting criteria is the file type selected.

The office action states that Anderson teaches resolution of image files and various types or formats of image files. However, neither Anderson nor Barros disclose a sorting criteria of resolution as claimed in claim 8 or a sorting criteria of file type as claimed in claim 9. Therefore, the combination does not disclose all the elements of either claim 8 or claim 9.

Based on the foregoing, the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections.

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.